

REMARKS

By the present amendment claims 3 and 4 have been newly added.

Claims 1-4 are thus pending in the application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title of the invention as being not descriptive. Applicant respectfully submits that the title of the invention has been amended. Therefore, the objection to the title should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,188,432 to Ejima in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,126,778 to Wheeler et al.

In view of the arguments that follow, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 2.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ejima in view of Wheeler et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's claim 1 recites an image sensing apparatus comprising an image sensing device for sensing the image of a subject and outputting image data representing the image of the subject; a display control unit for controlling a display unit in such a manner that the image of the subject represented by the image data output from said image sensing device will be displayed on a display screen; a designating unit for

designating an electronic zoom area in the image of the subject displayed on the display screen; a light-emission control unit for controlling a strobe light-emission device in such a manner that a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within the electronic zoom area is illuminated with strobe light; and a recording control unit for recording, on a recording medium, image data output from said image sensing device and data indicating position of the electronic zoom area or image data representing the image within the electronic zoom area.

The Examiner alleged that Ejima discloses an image sensing apparatus by referencing an electronic camera 1 in Fig. 1; an image sensing device for sensing the image of a subject and outputting image data representing the image of the subject and outputting image data representing the image of the subject by referencing CCD 20 in Fig. 3 and A/D 32 in Fig. 4; a display control unit for controlling a display unit in such a manner that the image of the subject represented by the image data output from said image device will be displayed on a display screen by referencing LCD 6 and touch tablet 6A in Fig. 9A; a designating unit in the image of the subject displayed on the display screen by referencing CPU 36, touch tablet 6A, PEN 46, and col. 9, lines 43-53; a light-emission control unit for controlling a strobe light emission device in such a manner that all of the subject that corresponds to an image is illuminated with strobe light by referencing strobe driving circuit 41, strobe 4, col. 2, lines 50-58 and col. 7, lines 7-13; a recording control unit for recording, on a recording medium, image data output from said image sensing device and data indicating position of the electronic zoom area or image data representing the image with

the electronic zoom area by referencing CPU control bus 49, memory card 24, col. 7, lines 47-52 and col. 8, lines 18-20.

The Examiner admitted that Ejima does not disclose that only a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within a zoom area is illuminated with strobe light. The Examiner alleged that Wheeler et al. disclose the details of operation between the strobe light emission device and the zoom function by referencing col. 2, lines 64 – col. 3, line 9. According to the Examiner, at the time the invention was made, one with ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a light-emission control unit for controlling a strobe light emission device in such a manner that a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within a zoom area is illuminated with strobe light, as taught by Wheeler et al., in the image sensing apparatus with a light-emission control unit of Ejima, as a means for improving lighting uniformity, providing inexpensive exposure control, and improving a photofinishing yield in one simpler operation. The Examiner further alleged that at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include a light-emission control unit for controlling a strobe light emission device in such a manner that a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within a zoom area is illuminated with strobe light, as taught by Wheeler et al., in the image sensing apparatus with a light-emission control unit, of Ejima.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ejima nor Wheeler et al., taken singly or in combination (assuming these teachings may be combined, which Applicant does not admit), disclose or teach all the claimed limitations of the present invention. Among other

things, the references do not teach "a light-emission control unit for controlling a strobe light-emission device in such a manner that a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within the electronic zoom area is illuminated with strobe light."

Ejima discloses an information processing apparatus that displays an object image and a line drawing overlapping each other. In the information processing apparatus, while shooting an object, a strobe is operated to illuminate an entire object in which the strobe emits light with a preset timing under the control of a strobe driving circuit. However, there is nothing in Ejima that discloses or teaches that after zooming an image within an electronic zoom area, "a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within the electronic zoom area is illuminated." Illuminating an entire object of Ejima is not analogous to illuminating "a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within the electronic zoom area."

Wheeler et al. do not make up for the deficiencies of Ejima. Wheeler et al. disclose a dedicated electronic flash in which the flash spread or beam width is based on the subject distance. The electronic flash of Wheeler et al. varies the angle-of-illumination of the flash and uses exposure information to determine whether flash illumination is needed to improve lighting contrast levels in a scene photographed. Moreover, the electronic flash merely increases the angle of illumination if a scene is in a far distance from a camera and reduces the angle of illumination if a scene is in a close distance from the camera. The angle of illumination illuminates an entire subject by varying the angle of illumination to have proper exposure. Applicant's light emission control unit is related to an electronic

zoom area and does not slide the lens of the camera to change an illumination angle to illuminate a subject based on response to a distance of the camera-to-subject. Furthermore, there is nothing in Wheeler et al. that discloses illuminating "a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within the electronic zoom area."

Therefore, neither Ejima nor Wheeler et al. disclose or teach claim 1. Claim 2 which discloses "illuminating, with strobe light, a part of the subject that corresponds to an image within an electronic zoom area designated in the image of the subject displayed on the display screen," is distinguishable over the prior art for at least the same reasons with regards to claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits the rejections of claims 1 and 2 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Demetra R. Smith-Stewart (Reg. No. 47,354), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

DAP
DRA/DSS/kmr
0905-0254P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000